

Minutes of Waukesha County Airport Operations Commission

November 10, 2010

Chairman Crowley called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. .

Commissioners Present: Crowley, Schoepke, Bluemke, Falstad and Richards

Others Present: Samuel K Cryer-PlaneSafe Aircraft Maintenance, Val Ramos- Airport Administration, Harry Becker- Manager Atlantic Aviation, Ken Witt-Tower Chief, Bob Groh-GSI, Brian Behrens-Spring City Aviation, Andrew J Kanehl, Vince Mastersen-Waukesha County, and Kurt Stanich-Airport Operations.

Approve modify minutes of Minutes of October 13, 2010

MOTION: Falstad moved with second by Schoepke to approve October 13, 2010 minutes. Motion carried.

Public Comment/Correspondence – Chairman Crowley welcomed Ken Witt, the new tower chief and introduced him to the Commission. Mr. Witt took over the position previously held by Andy Groth. Mr. Witt was at Martha's Vineyard on Cape Cod before coming to Waukesha. He has been with the FAA for 20 years, 18 years at Nantucket Island and 2 years at Kansas City Center.

Chairman Crowley recognized Andy Kanehl for public comment – Mr. Kanehl was commenting to the Commission regarding the termination of his lease agreement for lot 2317 Aviation Drive at the October 13, 2010 Commission meeting..

Mr. Kanehl - Has been in contact with Chairman Crowley and Mr. Markano over the past weeks. Mr. Kanehl has had problems with timing and building and missed a few deadlines. He tried working though that and tried to re-lease the property. Mr. Kanehl said he was trying to work with Mr. Markano to continue with the lease he had or to re-apply, Mr. Markano kept telling him the decision had been made by the Commission to terminate the lease. He contacted the Commissioner members, Commissioner Schoepke advised him to contact Chairman Crowley. Mr. Kanehl spoke with Chairman Crowley at length about the lot, then spoke with Mr. Markano about re-leasing the lot. Mr. Kanehl said he was informed that Mr. Markano was to contact Corporation Counsel to see about re-leasing the lot. On Wednesday, November 3rd, Chairman Crowley recommended Mr. Kanehl contact Mr. Markano to discuss this. Mr. Markano asked Mr. Kanehl to bring in the the hangar construction plans he already had. Mr. Kanehl said he had two sets of plans, one set was approved for a variance. Mr. Markano was supposed to get back to Mr. Kanehl on this after looking up the meeting minutes regarding the variance and after his discussion with Corporate Counsel on what to do about re-applying for the lease. On Monday, November 8th, Mr. Kanehl noticed on the November meeting agenda that someone else had applied for the lease. He contacted Chairman Crowley immediately and left a message. Chairman Crowley returned Mr. Kanehl's phone call after speaking with Mr. Markano. He was informed by Chairman Crowley to attend today's meeting to address the Commission on lot 2317.

Chairman Crowley expressed his appreciation to Mr. Kanehl for appearing before the Commission and that he was going to communicate to the Commission what has transpired over the past week. Chairman Crowley said he wanted Mr. Kanehl to give a public comment for the Commission to be fully aware of what was going on and that Mr. Kanehl wanted to re-apply for a lease on lot 2317 Aviation Drive.

Chairman Crowley – Has had about three conversations with Mr. Kanehl. He had also had communication with Mr. Markano most recently Monday, November 8th. Chairman Crowley requested Mr. Markano to brief Mr. Stanich on what has transpired, what he looked into in regards to the timeline of how this has panned out with the new application. There is an application for the Commission's review for the same property by Mr. Robert Groh. Mr. Kanehl communicated last week before the application was presented that he expressed interest in that property. Mr. Kanehl wanted to appeal. He was not present at the October meeting. The Commission discussed at the October meeting that they had done everything they were required to do. The Commission was advised by Corporation Counsel to terminate the lease based on inactivity and no progress. The Commission did what they have a responsibility to do by reviewing the information presented, denying the appeal, and terminating the lease. Therefore, that brings up opportunity for anyone to step up and apply for this lot. Mr. Groh has applied for this lot. The issues Chairman Crowley would like the Commission to discuss are: He asked Mr. Markano to work with Corporation Counsel and ask what could be done for Mr. Kanehl to re-apply. Is Mr. Kanehl like everyone else once again? If there are two parties interested in the same lot, how do we discuss which plan to approve? How do we want to move forward with the application process? Is it strictly chronological order, the first one that presents plans is approved? On the back page of our Lease Option Agreement it specifically states: " This application will be reviewed by the Airport Commission as hangar sites become available. Applications will be approved if it is determined to be consistent with the ALP and in the best interest of the airport. Approved applicants will be notified in writing of Airport Commission approval. Applicant will have 30 days from approval to execute a Lease Option Agreement. Should applicant fail to execute a Lease Option Agreement within 30 days the hangar site will then be offered to the next approved applicant." If there are two applications, the first one submitted is the one who has opportunity to be approved. The problem is that Mr. Kanehl did express interest last week before this application was approved. Chairman Crowley asked Mr. Markano, airport manager, what options does Mr. Kanehl have

available and please communicate to Mr. Kanehl what needs to be done so he can submit his application. Mr. Kanehl explained to me that he had hangar construction plans. Mr. Markano informed Chairman Crowley that one plan was different than what was presented in the past. Is this because of the variance? Mr. Kanehl said this has something to do with Jim Allen's hangar (2319 Aviation Drive). One is an exact copy and one is the plan on file that has the Commission's signatures. Mr. Kanehl also has a set of plans to do the exact same hangar as Jim Allen's as a variance from the City. It is Mr. Kanehl's understanding that the City signs the variance because they write the codes. Mr. Markano was supposed to look into the other set of plans regarding the variance to see if it was approved in past Commission minutes. Mr. Kanehl also mentioned that he asked about an application to re-lease the lot over a month ago. This would be a simple solution if the lease is terminated and they cannot extend it but he could start anew. He received very little response from Mr. Markano.

Chairman Crowley – Chairman Crowley was available to speak with Mr. Kanehl several times via the phone and Chairman Crowley asked Mr. Markano twice about what can be done for Mr. Kanehl to re-apply. Are there any restrictions because the Commission terminated Mr. Kanehl's lease on October 13, 2010 or is he submitting anew as a clean slate? If he has a clean slate, what is he required to do about this? Does he complete the application, submit the plans and ask to be on the agenda? That is a simple response Chairman Crowley said the Commission could have received for Mr. Kanehl. The Commission discussed this on October 13th, they expressed the desire for Mr. Kanehl to have the opportunity to lease property somewhere on the airport. If someone is interested they must abide by the covenants of the lease. Chairman Crowley said he did not receive a specific or firm response from Mr. Markano of what Mr. Kanehl should do. It was up to Mr. Markano to contact and communicate to Corporation Counsel what needed to be done. In the meantime an application has come before the Commission to discuss and possibly take action on and therefore Chairman Crowley feels there is a possibility there was some unfairness towards Mr. Kanehl in the application process. Chairman Crowley was not sure if Mr. Markano delayed this because he was not sure if there were other things that could have affected his ability to respond to Mr. Kanehl quickly. Mr. Kanehl was expecting a response from the Airport Manager (Mr. Markano) who at the time had more knowledge than Chairman Crowley would have and he gave Mr. Markano the direction to communicate with Mr. Kanehl. Mr. Markano did call Mr. Kanehl several times and Mr. Kanehl did stop in the office to go over the plans. Chairman Crowley said it is very important for the Commission to know what has occurred from October 13th until today what Mr. Kanehl needed to do to start anew.

Chairman Crowley asked Mr. Stanich to share with the Commission the information he received from Mr. Markano on this subject before he opens this for discussion.

Mr. Stanich – Mr. Stanich said he did not receive any information from Mr. Markano to share with the Commission on Mr. Kanehl, only that at the last Commission meeting it was stated that Mr. Kanehl has had a history of late lease payments. Mr. Stanich did have a timeline for Mr. Groh's application dating back to September 2010. Mr. Stanich is aware that Mr. Markano has been in contact with Mr. Kanehl several times but does not know if there was any resolution in any of these conversations. Mr. Markano did say that since Mr. Kanehl's lease was terminated he could apply for another lot on the airport.

Chairman Crowley – This is the question, other lots or the same lot.

Vice-Chairman Bluemke – It has been discussed that about a week or so Mr. Kanehl has requested Mr. Markano give him a resolution to this subject. In fairness to Mr. Markano, Mr. Kanehl has had the lease option on the land for several years. He has missed all kinds of dates eventually leading to the fact that the Commission decided the lease should be terminated. That's unfortunate, but if Vice-chairman Bluemke was the manager of the airport and Mr. Kanehl came to him and asked if he could make another application tomorrow, wanting an answer tomorrow or the next day, Vice-chairman Bluemke would go to Corporation Counsel. Vice-chairman Bluemke does not think that Mr. Markano had an obligation to respond automatically after this has been going on for two to three years. This does not mean that the Commission should not allow Mr. Kanehl to have a lease. Vice-chairman Bluemke does not think anyone is required to respond to anyone on that type of basis. In the meantime someone else made an application and what the Commission wants to do is determine what is best for the airport in total.

Mr. Kanehl – Mr. Kanehl has only had the lease a little over a year.

Commissioner Schoepke – The historic data probably does not mean as much as what the Commission needs to do now because the Commission has a situation that procedure does not seem to accommodate in writing. It would appear that, in general, common sense would say we have two offers. In real estate you need to protect fairness and privacy and someone must make a decision of how to choose who the new lease is given to. All the new information should be on the table and start anew. The Commission cannot make a decision without some private discussion because there may be some privacy information that should not be shared among the two offers.

Secretary Richards – There has been a lot of verbiage here this past month but the fact of the matter is from the legal point you have one application here.

Chairman Crowley – That is correct.

Secretary Richards – He can appreciate what has occurred the past thirteen months but right now, for Commission action, there is only one application.

Chairman Crowley – That is correct, but the concern as a Commissioner is fairness to all parties. Though the current lease has been terminated, the Commission is not pushing Mr. Kanehl off the property and would still like him to invest in a property and be a tenant.

Secretary Richards – The Commission is not going to accept another application on the same lot. We have a legal document for 2317 Aviation Drive. How can the Commission accept another application for the same lot?

Chairman Crowley – A response from the airport manager would be to submit another application.

Mr. Kanehl – He never received this response from Mr. Markano thirty days ago, asking if he could re-submit. The response was always the same, “I am sorry the decision has been made”. Mr. Kanehl said he was trying to find ways to fix this, by correcting the mistakes he made in the past and trying to continue with the lease and receive the same treatment Mr. Walter and others have received. If Mr. Markano had told him to come in and re-submit an application, he would have come in that day to set up a lease then the Commission would have two applications. Mr. Kanehl was not getting good constructive ideas through Mr. Markano. That is when he went to Chairman Crowley and received constructive ideas and Chairman Crowley instructed him to speak to Mr. Markano the next day and make sure everything was in order. Mr. Kanehl has everything he needs to build making him a good candidate for the property. When he came to meet with Mr. Markano, he was informed that he did not have a lease, and you need a lease before getting plans approved. Mr. Kanehl called Chairman Crowley the next day and explained what happened and Chairman Crowley said he would call Mr. Markano to see what Corporation Counsel’s response was for Mr. Kanehl. Simple solution would have been for Mr. Kanehl to re-apply and start over.

Vice-chairman Bluemke - Mr. Kanehl put himself in this position. What the Commission must decide is what is the proper way to go in fairness and best for those involved.

Secretary Richards – The Commission should not make this judgment. A motion should be made for this to go to Corporation Counsel before the Commission takes action.

Chairman Crowley – This has already been done so there is no need for an official motion.

Secretary Richards – Has the Commission heard from Corporation Counsel?

Chairman Crowley – As of Monday afternoon Mr. Markano did not have an answer from Corporation Counsel.

Commissioner Schoepke - Do we know if Corporation Counsel had enough information to say go ahead with what is on the table now or does the previous conversation with Mr. Kanehl bringing up with Mr. Markano still become a part of this? It sounds like Mr. Kanehl is contending that if he had known he needed to get a lease on the property he would have done this. Commissioner Schoepke is questioning if the Commission takes action on Mr. Groh’s application. Is the Commission getting ahead of itself because there may be some legal activity the Commission needs to be concerned about.

Chairman Crowley – Does a previous lease holder, who had his lease terminated, start from scratch or can he not lease that particular piece of property in the future? We have nothing that shows communication between our airport manager and Corporation Counsel. Chairman Crowley is not aware of any responsibilities on behalf of the Commission other than what is on the back of the lease application in the best interest of the airport. In the best interest of the airport, the Commission could have a conversation that we had a lease holder who did not abide by the covenants of the lease agreement, there have been repeated actions where the airport manager expressed his concerns, sent several documents some by registered mail, consulted with Corporation Counsel and received an official reply, the Commission took action on this at a Commission meeting and it was unanimous. The fact is there are many other parties that may be interested in that property and the Commission needs to move forward. The only real issue is the communication between the airport manager and Corporation Counsel. Did Mr. Markano have his hands full the past couple of weeks where he could not do that or was Corporation Counsel unavailable due to other pressing matters? The Commission needs to get an answer from Corporation Counsel.

Secretary Richards – Last sentence on application: “Should applicant fail to execute a Lease Option Agreement within 30 days the hangar site will then be offered to the next approved applicant.” He pointed out this was in writing.

Chairman Crowley – Who gives that communication to people to submit applications? Do they go to Val, to Kurt, do they only go to Keith, do they come to the Commission? Was Mr. Markano responsive enough before placing the current application on the agenda? On Friday, October 8th, Chairman Crowley had a conversation with Mr. Stanich and Mr. Groh’s application had been dropped off at the office. The agenda had not been approved to be sent out yet. Mr. Stanich sent an e-mail to Chairman Crowley asking if this should go on the agenda, and he replied yes. The applicant came forward and got on the table before the agenda went out. Therefore,

it is the Commission's responsibility to review application. If Chairman Crowley had replied no, The Commission would be discussing Mr. Kanehl's situation and in December have two applications, one would be November 5th and the other could be November 6th. The Commission would have to discuss and determine who gets the lease and it would not be in chronological order as long as all conditions have been met.

Commissioner Falstad – Is there a time frame when this has to be voted on?

Chairman Crowley – There is no time frame, it would just be added to the agenda. Mr. Groh has made a deposit of \$500 on the lot.

Vice-chairman Bluemke – There is an error on Mr. Groh's application. It shows the square footage as 400, a slight technical error, does this disqualify the application. Is it a valid application with the error?

Chairman Crowley – The Commission would explain the correction and amend it to show the correct footage and approve it. Once the termination of the lease agreement took place on October 13, 2010, Mr. Kanehl would be eligible like everyone else to re-apply and the Commission would have to determine based on the application and the plans submitted who would receive the lease.

Commissioner Schoepke – Landlords have to do what they have to in order to get a perception of the applicant. They may require additional information that is not typical to this situation because of the two applications. There has to be some differentiation, a sound basis for a decision. Chairman Crowley agreed with this.

Commissioner Falstad – Agrees with Secretary Richards. The Commission needs to go back to Corporation Counsel and explain exactly where the Commission is on this subject and ask for recommendations on how to proceed. The language Secretary Richards quoted is troublesome.

Secretary Richards – Recommended making a motion that all information be turned over to Corporation Counsel for their advice and that Mr. Kanehl be advised if he is still interested in the lot he should make a formal application. Vice-chairman Bluemke made a second to the motion. The Commissioners were all in favor of this recommendation. Vice-chairman Bluemke suggested Corporation be given a complete written analysis instead of just verbal. Chairman Crowley said he specifically asked Mr. Markano for that information, and we do not have anything at this time. Mr. Markano is critical in this decision. Mr. Markano needs to write up a timeline and then we need to have a communication to Corporation Counsel based on the Commission's recommendation.

Chairman Crowley asked if Mr. Groh was present and said the Commission would discuss his application in a moment. As Chairman of the Airport Operations Commission, he is looking for fairness for all on both sides.

Mr. Stanich – The last year with this lease, Mr. Kanehl has been late with lease payments, no communication when the staff sent out communication. It is unfair for Mr. Kanehl to come forward now to say he has not heard anything over the last thirty days. We did not hear anything for the last 350 days from Mr. Kanehl and as landlord's of the airport, and in fairness to all the tenants and future builders, Mr. Markano did not feel that it was proper and fair to all of the sudden respond to every request and move in a very fast manner when in fact we have not received payments on time nor had any communication back when it was necessary to make decisions. Mr. Stanich believes Mr. Markano exercised his due diligence over the year of this lease and understand there have been miscommunications over the last thirty days.

Mrs. Ramos – Mr. Kanehl called after the last Commission meeting, October 13, 2010, and requested a list of the Commissioners. Mrs. Ramos e-mailed the list along with a request to reply when he received the list. She never received a reply, the same as when she sent registered/certified correspondence to Mr. Kanehl. She finally e-mailed him again last week Thursday or Friday to see if he had received the list and he replied he received the list. If Mr. Kanehl had contacted Mr. Markano earlier to say he had financial problems or problems with the hangar, Mr. Markano works with everyone. Had Mr. Kanehl talked to Mr. Markano about his problems, the Commission would not be here discussing this subject.

Chairman Crowley – The key date is October 13, 2010, because that ended everything that happened in the past and now there is someone who wants to submit an application. Can they go forward with this or not? This is a question that should have been responded to. If they cannot, what is this answer based on? Is it because of an ordinance or is it on restrictions because once your lease is terminated you are not allowed to re-apply for that same property or at the airport? The Commission did not know this and not having a response is what is delaying further action from the Commission to determine what is fair. End of discussion.

Other Public Correspondence:

Mr. Stanich – Ron Hutchinson e-mailed Mr. Stanich regarding city fire inspections of private hangars. He was concerned that the city fire marshal wanted to inspect private hangar under a State statute that says inspections must be made by the fire marshal of all public buildings with employees. Mr. Stanich contacted the fire marshal and he said the statute was written by the Department of Commerce and considers airport hangars as commercial buildings therefore subject to the commercial building fire inspection code. Mr. Stanich will be drafting a letter to Mr. Hutchinson to relay this information to him. The fire marshal can petition the state for an

exemption for length or period of time on fire inspections for certain buildings in certain areas of the city based on their use. The fire marshal said he was not inclined to do so

Discussion and action on approval of lot application by Robert Groh for for 2317 Aviation Drive – Chairman Crowley expressed his appreciation to Mr. Groh for being present and because of the public comment of today's meeting there may not be any action taken by the Commission on his application. The Commission would like to hear any comments by Mr. Groh and review the application presented today. Chairman Crowley asked the Commission if they wanted to review the application now or if they had any suggestions on what to do at this time. Mr. Stanich informed the Commission that Mr. Groh contacted him in September regarding interest in constructing a hangar at the airport. He was originally shown lots in the new phase II southeast hangar area that was developed in 2006. When they were driving by the 2317 lot he asked if this was available and Mr. Stanich said it was not. On October 10th Mr. Groh sent an e-mail to Mr. Stanich requesting information on the process necessary to receive hangar construction approval along with an approximate time frame for the process in regards to the southeast hangar area. After the October 13, 2010 Commission meeting Mr. Stanich contacted Mr. Groh to ask if he was still interested in the 2317 lot in an interest to get the lot leased so that the County would not lose any budget revenue for the year. Mr. Groh said he was interested and Mr. Stanich informed him of the steps necessary to submit an application.

Chairman Crowley opened the item for discussion.

Commission Schoepke – Mr. Groh is here today. Does the Commission want to hear input today from Mr. Groh?

Chairman Crowley – Yes, Mr. Groh is present. Does the Commission want to review his application, make sure everything is in order and hear his comments and take action on this? Or are there other options? The Commission can ask Mr. Groh for his comments and table this for the next meeting. A motion was made by Secretary Richards and a second by Vice-chairman Bluemke to table this matter item until we hear from Corporation Counsel on any restrictions or modifications that may be necessary on our part.

Chairman Crowley thanked Mr. Groh again for being at the meeting. Chairman Crowley said he took full responsibility for adding this item for today's agenda and not being able to take action today and moving the application process forward for him. Chairman Crowley said Mr. Groh had submitted the application, made the \$500 deposit on the lot and had the plans available. Mr. Groh said he did not have the plans yet but would in about two weeks. That would comply with the thirty days as stated on the application. If this item is on the agenda for the December meeting, Chairman Crowley suggested Mr. Groh bring the plans with him along with the application for the Commission to discuss. Secretary Richards reminded Chairman Crowley that Mr. Groh should submit the plans to the airport manager's office for review prior to the Commission meeting.

Chairman's Report – The Commission alternated meetings times this year (8:00 am and 6:00 pm). During the several evening meetings we had one or two persons in attendance. Mr. Becker of Atlantic Aviation is the only person to attend these meetings. The Commission's reason to alternate the times was to give the airport community an opportunity to attend if they were unable to attend the morning meetings. Chairman Crowley asked the Commissioners for their thoughts on continuing with this schedule in the coming year.

Vice-chairman Bluemke - Would like to revert back to morning meetings, the present schedule is confusing, something else to keep track of and it doesn't seem to make any difference.

Secretary Richards - If an issue comes up that the Community would be involved with, the Commission can schedule a special meeting.

Commissioner Schoepke - Should the Commission request feed back from the airport community again with some type of questionnaire since it's only been tested a few months? If the airport community isn't interested, he agrees the Commission should return to the regular meeting time.

Chairman Crowley – The airport community can communicate with the Commission or airport staff via voice mail, e-mail, letter or a personal visit with any meeting concerns and this can be brought up in the public comment/correspondence portion of the next Commission meeting and acted upon at the following Commission meeting.

Samuel Cryer – Is there some way these meetings can be posted to inform the community? Can signs be posted at the gates to remind the community of a meeting coming up.

Chairman Crowley – For years, the Commission has met every second Wednesday of the each month.

Mr. Stanich – The airport newsletter lists the meeting dates and times for the next three months, so it is communicated. Communication Mr. Stanich received from the tenants was interest in evening meetings, which the Commission agreed to this year. Other complaint was why should tenants attend if there is nothing of interest on the agenda. Could this information be listed in the Airport Manager's report?

Commissioner Schoepke – Why would the tenants not be inclined to the public comment/correspondence portion of the meeting? This is a form to express their interest.

Commissioner Bluemke – The Commission does not have the responsibility to provide this to the tenants. The meetings should be set up so they are easily accomplished and if someone wants to attend they can attend.

Chairman Crowley – The Commission will revert back to the morning meeting schedule. The Commissioner's received the meeting schedule for 2011.

Chairman Crowley - This past month there were several acts by Mother Nature at the airport. And by quick communication by the airport staff, Chairman Crowley had the opportunity to witness first hand what goes on and how well Public Works worked with airport staff. In the most recent windstorm there were 62 mph wind gusts and there were three T-hangars that had roofs partially ripped off. Chairman Crowley came out to the airport around 3 pm that day and was escorted to the damage area by Mr. Markano. What Chairman Crowley witnessed was very amazing. Within an hour of Chairman Crowley being notified of the damage, Mrs. Bussler had already spoken with the Highway Shop Dispatch, and several trucks were dispatched to the airport and a thirty yard dumpster at the airport was already full of debris. All of the workers were working their best to clean everything up and with the wind gusts so strong making the clean-up more difficult. Another thirty yard dumpster was ordered because of the amount of debris caused by the wind storm. The quick response by Public Works was quite impressive. The Commissioners received an e-mail on this from Chairman Crowley as well as Allison Bussler, County Executive Vrakas and Mr. Markano. Everyone worked so well together there was never any down time at the airport, runways were not closed and there were no incidents. One of the biggest concern was nails, just one nail could be a problem. Mr. Markano and Mr. Stanich were physically picking up fiberboard, nails, and pieces. The snow broom was used to brush off some of the debris and public works employees stayed on the job until everything was taken care of. It was just a great collaboration of efforts to take care of the situation quickly. Later that night another portion of a T-hangar roof was ripped off. The next day Mr. Markano, Mr. Stanich and a Huber facility worker spent the day cleaning up. The staff wear many hats, and to close the comment, hats off to all they were doing that day and the following day. There will be some decisions to be made regarding the T-hangars, they are covered under the County's insurance. Mr. Stanich will have more information on this in his report. Chairman Crowley also wanted to thank Atlantic Aviation for their assistance with the clean-up and Flight for Life for taking aerial photos of the T-hangar damage. An e-mail communication was sent to everyone involved including the County Executive thanking them for their efforts and assistance.

Secretary Richards – Concerned if the Commission should be discussing what transpired in today's public comment during meeting time? With the Commission asking if airport staff did what they were supposed to do? Shouldn't matters like this be done in executive session? If the Commission is analyzing staff as to what they are doing or if the Commission has complied should this be public information? Does the Commission have capability of going into executive session?

Commissioner Falstad – The only way that this is not a public record is to go into closed session and it does get involved to do this. There are only a few special situations that permit the Commission to go into closed session.

Secretary Richards – When the Commission is analyzing the Commission's action they have taken internally, should this be public scrutiny?

Vice-chairman Bluemke – Agrees with Commissioner Falstad.

Chairman Crowley – This matter was out of fairness and trying to get all of the communications on this in the open.

Airport Manager's Report –

New Tower Chief – Mr. Stanich said in the few dealings he has had with Mr. Witt, he is very competent, diligent, respectful of everything that happens around the airport. He will be a fantastic addition to the airport team.

T-Hangars – Estimate of damage repairs for the three hangars was between \$65,000 to \$75,000. Insurance will cover most of the repairs. We are still working with the County's insurance adjusters to see who will pay what portion of these damages. Unfortunately since all of the repairs total more than \$25,000 a Public Works bid is necessary to have this work done. Because of the bidding process, there will be a delay in repairing the hangars. Bid notices needs to be posted in the papers, one will go out on the 15th and one on the 22nd. We will do a walk through through of the hangars on the 30th and the bid will not be opened until December 7th. We tried to move it along because of the upcoming weather, but this was the quickest time we could get with the County Purchasing Department.

Vice-chairman Bluemke – Are the T-hangars occupied?

Mr. Stanich – Some of the hangars were occupied and thanks to Atlantic for relocating some of the tenants to other hangars. Personal property is in some of the hangars, and this has been taken care of by plastic sheeting, so they are protected.

Vice-chairman Bluemke - If there is an urgency to protect that property, isn't there a procedure to change the bid process?

Mr. Stanich – This was already asked and Karen Bollinger of Purchasing said no.

Vice-chairman Bluemke – On something like this, you would think Corporation Counsel would make the decision.

Mr. Becker – There is some personal equipment in the hangars that was not moved with the airplanes. Atlantic shifted aircraft to other locations, but toolboxes and other personal items are still in the hangars. Atlantic did tarp some of the personal items, but if the roofs collapse and there could be water damage.

Vice-chairman Bluemke – Airport staff should be talking to someone other than the purchasing agent. The purchasing agent is not qualified to make that kind of decision.

Commissioner Falstad – Karen Bollinger is a very competent person, but agrees with Vice-chairman Bluemke. If the Commission would like, Commissioner Falstad will pursue this along with Mr. Stanich's help to see if this can be expedited.

Construction update:

Gates - Work on gate 11 should be completed within the next two weeks. With the cold weather coming in work on gate 9 will be held off for now.

Guidance Signs – Highway Lighting is working on installing the guidance signs at the entrances to the southwest and southeast hangars. They will finish installing the signs once the concrete is cured next week.

Fence – Northway Fence started installing the 10 foot chain link fence around the west side of the airport.

Gate card access system – Greg Stern received Mr. Markano's e-mail from Bill (Associated Technical Services) regarding the printer and access card specified and working to have computer and gate card issues resolved.

Tree/Brush – Continue with the tree and brush clearing at the airport. With the clearing along the fence line hopefully this will help in reducing the cost of fence repairs because of overgrowth. There has been some cost saving with Public Works do the clearing work.

Signage – Mrs. Bussler said money for new signs has been included in the Parks Department budget for 2011. Mrs. Bussler requested Mr. Shaver, Parks & Land Use, to create an interdepartmental work group to evaluate signs for the County and see where the money could be spent and assured that the airport would be included in that group. Mr. Stanich suggested the Commission provide direction for the workgroup on airport signage (what it should like and where sign(s) should be placed).

Marketing update:

Logo – At the Commission's request a new airport logo is now complete. Commissioner's were given a sheet with the new logo.

Corporate brochure – the content has been sent to Waukesha County staff in the IT department to get graphic design on brochure started and should have the final on hand within the next week or so for Commission review and comment.

Website – Progressing nicely, there may be some delay due to workload at IT department. They are redoing the entire Waukesha County Website and we are working along with them to get the airport pages up. The Commission will get a preview before it goes live.

Newsletter – Very positive feed back on the October newsletter. The next newsletter will be in early December. Any ideas or suggestions for future articles are greatly appreciated.

News article – Article in Lake Country News on New Beginnings Church Reverend Spencer. Reverend Spencer brings disadvantaged youth to the airport on Saturday mornings and gives them the opportunity to sit in a flight simulator and see how the controls work. He has partnered with airport tenants Charles Allen and Stan Markus that volunteer their time to the group. The group has been successful, since 2006 already several students have received their private pilot certificates. One from the group is at Notre Dame pursuing professional aviation. This student would not be there if not for the wonderful help from these volunteer tenants. Stan Markus owns a T6 and gives the kids their first ride when they come as a group. He is producing a CD, he is a classical guitar player, and all of the proceeds from this CD will be donated to this group to keep it going because it has been so successful.

Self-Fueling – At the last Commission meeting the Commission asked about the possibility of self-fueling at the airport. The Commission received an Application for Self-fueling at the airport explaining the procedure and information that needs to be submitted. There is information and an application for the aircraft self-fueling permit. The information provided is from the County ordinance. Secretary Richards recalled when someone expressed interest in self-fueling several years ago and nothing was done because of the difficulties the ramifications of providing this service at the airport. Mr. Stanich said self-fueling is possible if someone is willing to expend the capital to make it happen. There is a large sum of money involved because of the NAPA regulations, the state and federal standards, double wall tank and containment systems.

Budget – Airport budget looks good and will be under budget conservatively by about \$100,000 based on projections for the year. Expenses were decreased significantly due to re-working the snow contract, better grounds management, and as part of the Public

Works Department , being able to use their equipment at less cost. This dollar amount may change depending on the T-hangar repairs not covered by insurance.

Tower Activity and Fuel reports – Tower activity was down but fuel was up. Fuel was up by about 9% for the year and 46% on the month compared to last year.

Future agenda items:

Sign location
501C
Naming rights

Adjourn

Bluemke moved, second by Schoepke to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned 9:55 a.m.

Next meeting: Wednesday, December 8, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Richards
Secretary
November 10, 2010